

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/003,915	11/02/2001	Anthony J. Mauro	460.2115USU	7768	
75	590 01/31/2006		EXAM	INER	
Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.			ANDERSON, CATHARINE L		
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. 10th Floor ART UNIT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
One Landmark Square			3761	3761	
Stamford, CT	06901-2682		DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			6
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/003,915	MAURO ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C. Lynne Anderson	3761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appo	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follor places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	ig date of the final rejecti	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		E FIRST REPLT WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of eunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	xtension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig or than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further or (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloc) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beappeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))	onsideration and/or search (see NC ow); etter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally re	TE below); educing or simplifying	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a 		, timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) rejected:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good at was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appears and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the reconstruction	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.

TATYANA ZALUKAEVA
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER

See Continuation Sheet.

13. Other: ____.

11. 🖾 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that the prior art of record fails to disclose a specific amount based on the total weight of the tampon, it is noted that the instant claim discloses a very broad range. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that addition of a surfactant to a tampon would fall within such a range. Further, as noted in the Office Action dated 10/6/05, the general conditions of the claim (not the specific intended use argued by the applicant) are disclosed in the prior art, and therefore optimization of the range involves only routine skill in the art.

In response to the applicant's argument that the prior art of record fail to show how one of ordinary skill can specifically select the elements from Baker's listed ingredients, it is noted that a reference anticipates a species no matter how many other species are named (see MPEP 2131.02). It does not matter if the species are not disclosed as being preferred; the reference still anticipates the claim. One skilled in the art would specifically select the elements precipely because the elements were positively disclosed by Baker.

In response to the applicant's argument that the Action improperly relies on the level of skill in the art as a source of motivation to suggest the claimed limitations, it is noted that Fischetti discloses the elements as equivalents for the intended use. An express suggestion to substitute an equivalent component or process for another is not necessary to render such a substitution obvious. In re Fout 213 USPQ 532 (see MPEP 2144.06).